UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,825	02/11/2004	David P. Vronay	MS305755.01 (MSFTP523US)	3367

27195 7590 05/15/2008

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, LE V	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/15/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,825	VRONAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LE NGUYEN	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 February 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-17 and 19-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5, 7-17 and 19-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 2/14/08.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-24 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 17, 20, 23 and 24 are independent claims. Claims 6 and 18 have been cancelled; and, claims 1, 17, 20, 23 and 24 have been amended.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 is not enabled since a display component cannot determine data in a data set.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. In the phrase "data in at least one data set…having respective corresponding types" of lines 3-6 of claim 1, it is unclear what the corresponding types are and what they are respective to. The Office will interpret the phrase to mean: information/data is selected for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by determining information or selecting data that relates to an application instantiated or being employed by a user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10-17, 19-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (US 7,191,411) in view of Chu et al. ("Chu", 2007/0198930), and further in view of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP").

As per claim 1, although Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising a set component that identifies sets of data (Abstract; figs. 1(a-b); sets of data 10a-10b) and a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view (figs. 1(a-b); semi-collapsed view 10b), Moehrle does not explicitly disclose a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, *and* an expanded view. Chu teaches a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, and an expanded view (fig. 7A; paragraphs [0045], [0048], [0050] and [0057]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Chu with the method of Moehrle to provide users only the data view of interest.

However, Moehrle and Chu do not explicitly disclose information/data being selected for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by determining information or selecting data that relates to an application instantiated or being employed by a user. MS XP teaches information/data that is selected for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by determining information or selecting data that relates to an application instantiated or being employed by a user (fig. 3, e.g. the instantiated application/application employed by user such as Word documents are grouped together in the semi-collapsed view). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of MS XP with the method of Moehrle and Chu so that users have a menu that provides quick navigation to selected items or active paths.

As per claim 2, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising the display component view displaying a subset of the at least one data set in an expanded view (Moehrle: fig. 1b; expanded view 10c), and another subset in a collapsed view (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 46-48; collapsed view 10a).

As per claim 4, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising a quantity of data items displayed in the semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon a user selection (Moehrle: col. 1, lines 37-53).

As per claim 5, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising a quantity of data items displayed in the semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon a function of available display area (Moehrle: col. 1, lines 23-37).

As per claim 7, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising cycling being based, at least in part, upon user input (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 46-48).

As per claim 10, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising information displayed in the semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon a user's focus of attention (Moehrle: col. 1, lines 37-53).

As per claim 11, although the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising at least some of the information displayed in the semi-collapsed view (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; semi-collapsed view 10b), the modified Moehrle does not explicitly disclose the information being color-coded. Official Notice is taken that displaying color-coded information is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate displaying color-coded information with the method of the modified Moehrle to give focus or emphasis to certain information such as having information in a menu grayed out to give emphasis that such information is not user accessible.

As per claim 12, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising the sets of data representing a logical or physical grouping of data items (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); e.g. hierarchical menus of fig. 1b are organized under “file”).

As per claim 13, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising grouping being based, at least in part, upon at least one of physical location of the data items, author of the data items, creation time or date of the data

items, modification time or date of the data items, data item size, data item type, data item category and content of the data items (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); grouping by category/content).

As per claim 14, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data wherein at least some of the data items are computer files (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 18-53).

As per claim 15, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising a file viewer (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 18-53).

As per claim 16, the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising an input device that facilitates navigation of the semi-collapsed view (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; selection of a node/menu item is described for display wherein an input device is inherent in order to facilitate such a selection).

Claims 17 and 19, in combination, are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, although Moehrle teaches a user interface comprising a first region displaying some data items of a first data set in a semi-collapsed view and a second region displaying data items of a second data set in a collapsed or expanded view (figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; expanded 10c, semi-collapsed view 10b and collapsed view 10a), Moehrle does not explicitly disclose a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, an expanded view, *and* a collapsed view. Chu teaches a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, an expanded view, and a collapsed view (fig. 7A; paragraphs

[0045], [0048], [0050] and [0057]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Chu with the method of Moehrle to provide users only the data view of interest.

However, Moehrle and Chu do not explicitly disclose selected data items being determined based on respective classifications of the data items and one or more applications associated with a user. MS XP teaches selected data items being determined based on respective classifications of the data items and one or more applications associated with a user (fig. 3, e.g. selected data items such as Word documents are grouped/classified together in the semi-collapsed view). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of MS XP with the method of Moehrle and Chu so that users have a menu that provides quick navigation to selected items or active paths.

As per claim 21, the modified Moehrle teaches a user interface comprising a control region that facilitates scrolling through the first data set of the first region (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; e.g. 10c is a result of scrolling through the first data set of the first region (10b)).

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (US 7,191,411) in view of Chu et al. ("Chu", 2007/0198930), in view of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP"), and further in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP").

As per claims 3, 8 and 9, although the modified Moehrle teaches a system that facilitates access to data comprising information displayed in the semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon a function of available display area (Moehrle: col. 1, lines 23-37), the modified Moehrle does not explicitly disclose a semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon inference of a user's preference and/or history of a user, including a user state. MS XP teaches a semi-collapsed view being based, at least in part, upon inference of a user's preference and/or history of a user, including a user state (figs. 3 and 5; e.g. inference of user's preference based upon history of user selection so that a person having a word processing application instantiated can view a representation of word processing application document(s) displayed in the squeeze/semi-collapsed state). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of MS XP with the method of the modified Moehrle in order to take into consideration how users have used the interface to best establish an optimal layout and user environment.

10. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 7,191,411) in view of Chu et al. ("Chu", 2007/0198930), in view of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP"), and further in view of Screen Dumps of East ("East").

As per claim 22, although the modified Moehrle teaches a user interface comprising a scrolling control region that facilitates access to the data items of the first data set (Moehrle: figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; e.g. 10c is a result of scrolling through the first data set of the first region (10b)), the modified Moehrle does not explicitly disclose a scroll bar or a scroll bar that facilitates access to data items. East teaches a

scroll bar or a scroll bar that facilitates access to data items (figs. 3 and 4). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of East with the method of the modified Moehrle in order to view obscured items as in the case when the menu is expanded or when the window is scaled.

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 7,191,411) in view of Chu et al. ("Chu", 2007/0198930), in view of Screen Dumps of IE ("IE"), and further in view of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP").

As per claim 23, although Moehrle teaches a first field comprising information associated with at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view and a second field comprising information associated with another data set to be displayed in at least one of an expanded view and a collapsed view (figs. 1(a-b); col. 1, lines 37-53; expanded 10c, semi-collapsed view 10b and collapsed view 10a), Moehrle does not explicitly disclose a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, *and* an expanded view. Chu teaches a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, and an expanded view (fig. 7A; paragraphs [0045], [0048], [0050] and [0057]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Chu with the method of Moehrle to provide users only the data view of interest.

Moehrle and Chu still do not explicitly disclose a data packet transmitted between two or more computer components that facilitate access to data. IE teaches a data packet transmitted between two or more computer components that facilitates access to

data the data packet comprising a first field comprising information associated with at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view (fig. 3; *transmitted data packet via the IE browser layer "http://…"*) and a second field comprising information associated with another data set to be displayed in at least one of an expanded view and a collapsed view (fig. 5; *"3 Weeks Ago" of "History", which includes a collapsed view of "Today", is displayed in an expanded view and can be displayed in a collapsed view via another click of "3 Weeks Ago"*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of IE with the method of Moehrle and Chu in order to reach across physical boundaries and allow users to communicate with remote computers.

However, Moehrle, Chu & IE do not explicitly disclose data being selected for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by selecting data that relates to an application being employed by a user. MS XP teaches data being selected for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by selecting data that relates to an application being employed by a user (fig. 3, e.g. the application employed by user such as Word documents are grouped together in the semi-collapsed view). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of MS XP with the method of Moehrle, Chu & IE so that users have a menu that provides quick navigation to selected items or active paths.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 17, 20, 23 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquires

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lvn
Patent Examiner
May 11, 2008

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174